From: Aditi Sherikar
To: info-POC

Subject: Written Public Comment for 4/8 Probation Oversight Commission Meeting

Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 4:00:07 PM

Attachments: <u>image001.png</u>

3.16.21 Probation Plan.png 8.10.20 Probation Plan.png

Letter to BOS Motion Report on Decreased Incarcerated Youth Population August 27 2020.pdf

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Please find below written public comment for the April 8, 2021 meeting of the Probation Oversight Commission. This comment relates to Item III, Part 6: Discussion and take appropriate action on the closure of the State of California Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ): Transition Plan.

Dear Commissioners,

We write to you regarding the recent report back from the Youth Development and Diversion (YDD) Office and Probation on the implementation of their Plan to maintain the decreased population of incarcerated youth in Los Angeles County (attached). We have a number of concerns regarding the lack of progress and clarity in many of the commitments made by Probation last August and would appreciate your assistance in moving this Plan forward successfully.

Los Angeles Youth Uprising ("LAYUP") is a coalition of 17 organizations that works to end youth incarceration, reform probation practices, divert youth out of the juvenile justice system, and reinvest resources into a comprehensive system of youth development. We are dedicated to building power through youth leadership, direct action organizing and policy advocacy to ensure all youth in Los Angeles ("LA") County can rise and thrive.

Background:

On June 9, 2020, the Board of Supervisors (BOS) passed a motion called *Maintaining* the Decreased Population of Incarcerated Youth in Los Angeles County, which called on YDD and Probation to create a plan to continue the reduction in the incarcerated youth population following COVID 19, which was to focus on:

- Supporting and expanding community-based alternatives to detention services and placement options, including the reallocation of existing resources in order to prioritize such alternatives;
- Legislative and local policy changes to support this goal;
- Evaluating outcomes for youth released since March 2020, and those diverted or otherwise released early from detention facilities, going forward.

Probation (with help from YDD and limited input from community partners) presented a plan to keep the reduction in the detained youth population in August of 2020. The Plan lacked detail and resulted in concern regarding the implementation of the Plan. The Plan did not direct any funds toward community-based and run organizations

(CBO's) to support young people. The Los Angeles Youth Uprising Coalition responded to this Plan with a <u>letter</u> to the Board of Supervisors and raised a number of concerns about implementation and actual impact on LA County youth.

Present:

On March 16, 2021, Probation and YDD provided a 6-month report back to the Board on the progress of the Plan. Much of this report-back is non-responsive, as was expected given that the original recommendations created a great deal of room for interpretation. With the closure of DJJ facilities upon us, it is imperative that the recommendations of this plan be followed and that they be implemented with integrity. This cannot be an opportunity for closed camps to re-open. Instead, it is a call for much of Probation's \$500 million budget to be redirected to community-based alternatives and that those dollars go to the meaningful support and healing, neither of which Probation as an institution is designed to provide, of all system-impacted young people but especially those who would have otherwise found themselves in a DJJ facility.

Additionally, as the County lifts COVID restrictions, more and more young people will be subjected to traditional forms of surveillance and supervision through schools and in their communities. Probation must work to ensure that LA County youth do not unnecessarily cycle through a system that we can all acknowledge causes significant trauma and harm. This requires knowing who is coming into halls and camps, who is leaving and with what support.

Ultimately, there is a real incentive to create a plan without teeth; it allows Probation to continue working without accountability and transparency, it allows Probation to maintain the status quo. We are asking the Probation Oversight Commission to ensure that the system maintains a reduced incarcerated youth population and that this extends beyond the pandemic. This is not a call for more money. It is a call for **data and information**, which is really a foundational step in creating a plan that works for young people and their families.

The August Plan committed to collecting and sharing the following data points. In their 6-month update on the Plan's implementation, they provided almost none of these data points and receiving them still remains critical to maintain and further reduce the population of camps and halls, as well as to evaluate outcomes, as mandated in the June 9th motion.

- a. Demographic characteristics of youth released, diverted, and detained to better understand equity in access;
- b. Information about the stage at which and reason for which a young person is diverted or released:
- c. Timeframes of detention, release, referral, and enrollment in services by type to better understand how quickly young people are being connected to diversion and reentry services;
- d. Outcomes for young people experiencing various interventions, including measures of youth wellbeing and any further contact with the justice system;

- e. Opportunities to invest in promising practices and reduce gaps and barriers to services for young people and families.
- f. Opportunities to use findings to inform data collection and assessment practices moving forward.

With under 400 young people currently in LA County Halls and Camps, there is absolutely no reason that an infrastructure cannot be created to collect and share this data WITHOUT additional funding.

In order to make an informed plan for DJJ realignment, much more information is needed on the youth currently held in camps and halls. The following information will help to inform the way LA County plans to support all youth subject to incarceration in - who are we serving, how are we serving them, what's working and what isn't?

- a. Current programming/providers
 - i. Types (writing, mentorship, arts, music, tutoring etc.) in each facility
 - ii. # of youth each provider has the capacity to work with (or actually works with)
 - iii. Hours per week of programming per provider per facility
- b. Current numbers in each camp
 - i. Generally, what are all of the factors that determine which facility a young person is assigned?
 - ii. Categorization of adjudicated offenses of the population in each facility
 - iii. Length of sentence associated with adjudicated offenses
 - iv. Demographics (especially on youth with special needs such as CSEC youth, youth with disabilities, and youth with more acute developmental disabilities)
 - v. Zip codes of where youth lived prior to detention

Our ask is 1) that Probation provide what it committed to provide last August in its initial report-back to the Board and 2) that Probation be held responsible for sharing the who, what, where and why behind each young person's contact with the system.

We appreciate your support,

Los Angeles Youth Uprising Coalition



Aditi Sherikar

Youth Justice Policy Associate

Children's Defense Fund-California

811 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1000 Los Angeles, CA 90017

- е
- o (213) 225-8597
- c (510) 364-6773



March 16, 2021

Los Angeles County **Board of Supervisors**

TO:

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis, Chair

Hilda L. Solis First District Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell Supervisor Sheila Kuehl

Holly J. Mitchell Second District Supervisor Janice Hahn Supervisor Kathryn Barger

Sheila Kuehl

FROM:

Christina R. Ghaly, M.D., Directo Department of Health Services

Janice Hahn Fourth District

Third District

Adolfo Gonzales, Chief

Probation Department

Kathryn Barger Fifth District

SUBJECT:

MAINTAINING THE DECREASED POPULATION OF

INCARCERATED YOUTH IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

(ITEM #10, JUNE 9, 2020)

Christina R. Ghaly, M.D.

Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D., Ph.D. Chief Deputy Director, Clinical Affairs

Nina J. Park, M.D. Chief Deputy Director, Population Health

313 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 912 Los Angeles, CA 90012

> Tel: (213) 288-8050 Fax: (213) 481-0503

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

On June 9, 2020 the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed the Probation Department (Probation) and the Youth Development and Diversion (YDD) Division, in consultation with the Public Defender's Office, the Alternate Public Defender's Office, the Independent Juvenile Defender's Office, the District Attorney's office, the Courts, the Chief Executive Office (CEO). County Counsel, Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Health Services, Department of Public Health, and community stakeholders to develop a plan for maintaining the reductions - and where possible continuing to reduce - populations of youth in the juvenile camps and halls at or below the levels reached during this pandemic to avoid returning to the higher incarceration numbers and rates at which youth were detained prior to March 2020, including recommendations for:

- "To advance the health of our patients and our communities by providing extraordinary care"
- a. Supporting and expanding community-based alternatives and placement options to detention services, including the reallocation of existing resources in order to prioritize such alternatives;
- b. Legislative and local policy changes to support this goal; and
- c. Evaluating outcomes for youth released since March 2020, and those diverted or otherwise released early from detention facilities. going forward.

Key themes from the collaborative planning group included a desire for more time to review data, address questions, and align the proposed plan with the work of the Youth Justice Work Group (YJWG) and other efforts. The group emphasized the need to continue to collaboratively develop and implement effective strategies for reducing the population of incarcerated youth with increased transparency. Recognizing that more time and more shared discussion is needed to fully address the nuanced hopes and



www.dhs.lacounty.gov



August 27, 2020

Board of Supervisors County of Los Angeles, California c/o Executive Officer of the Board Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple St., Ste. 383 Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Plan Resulting from the Motion: *Maintaining the Decreased Population of Incarceration Youth in Los Angeles County (June 9, 2020)*

Dear Board of Supervisors:

We write in regards to the motion *Maintaining the Decreased Population of Incarceration Youth in Los Angeles County* (Item #10, June 9, 2020), and the resulting plan for how to achieve its goals, which was submitted to the Board on August 10, 2020. We appreciate the intent behind this motion; however, as members of Los Angeles Youth Uprising, we would like to raise concerns about the proposed plan ("Plan") and offer some key considerations and solutions to assure that the County is successful in fulfilling its commitment to maintaining the reduced populations in juvenile halls and camps, and where possible, continuing to reduce the population. Furthermore, we want to uplift the immediate need for divestment from the *Juvenile Institutions Services* budget unit and reinvestment into community-based youth services. With this reduction in the incarcerated youth population, the County is on track to spend over \$750,000 per year to incarcerate just one young person, a fact which is unacceptable in a time of dire economic hardship and a named commitment to a "care-first" model.

Los Angeles Youth Uprising ("LAYUP") is a coalition of 17 organizations that works to end youth incarceration, reform probation practices, divert youth out of the juvenile justice system, and reinvest resources into a comprehensive system of youth development. We are dedicated to building power through youth leadership, direct action organizing and policy advocacy to ensure all youth in Los Angeles ("LA") County can rise and thrive.

Review of the Plan for Maintaining the Decreased Population of Incarcerated Youth in Los Angeles County

Members from LAYUP, individuals from the Youth Development and Diversion ("YDD") Office, the Probation Department ("Probation"), the District Attorney's Office, the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office, the Alternate Public Defender's Office and the Independent Juvenile

Defender Program came together on two occasions to discuss the report requested by the Board of Supervisors' motion mentioned above. While it was the beginning of a meaningful conversation, it quickly became clear that Probation had not tracked, with any level of specificity, what actions resulted in the decreased population of incarcerated youth. When asked for data, copies of protocols, details on trainings, and processes for Probation-led diversion, we were met with very little information. Ultimately, with this motion, Probation has been charged with monitoring Probation. Without an external review process, it is very difficult to know where the answers and missteps lie.

We would like to outline both our concerns and potential solutions in the following section, with sections directly quoted from the Plan in *italics*, followed by our feedback.

- 1. Expand referrals to the Division of YDD to continue to reduce the number of young people arrested for low level offenses and referred to Probation.
 - a. Develop and disseminate a standard YDD referral form for law enforcement agencies countywide to use pre-citation and in lieu of referral to the Citation Diversion Program for cases including, but not limited to those listed in Penal Code Section 640; YDD and Probation will collaborate to explore opportunities to ensure that all cases that could be referred to community-based youth diversion and development instead of the Citation Diversion Program are routed to YDD.
 - b. Grant delegated authority needed to allow YDD's contracts to receive referrals from additional referrers beyond the original cohort of original law enforcement jurisdictions, including schools, Probation, and the DA's Office.
 - c. Building on the recommendations for implementing Senate Bill 439, establish at least one additional staff position for YDD to ensure there is capacity to better resource the expansion of meaningful programming for youth referred precitation, including the facilitation of capacity-building for providers, implementation of new referral partnerships, and communications/outreach.
 - d. Develop and share countywide standards for diversion.

Concerns and Considerations:

 It is worth naming that the greatest barrier to reducing youth arrest and expanding prearrest diversion since the creation of YDD is law enforcement's lack of meaningful participation in referring youth to the program. Without addressing this issue, all reform efforts will yield minimal results.

FREE OUR FUTURE.

(323) 490-0601 | kparekh@childrensdefense.org

- Section 1a As it exists right now, Probation believes its jurisdiction for the Citation Diversion Program lies within Section 256 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. As a result, in addition to Penal Code 640, the Citation Diversion Program handles violations of all but four sections of the Vehicle Code, violations of any provision of state and local law relating to traffic offenses, loitering or curfew, and violations found within 14 other sections of the law ranging from the Business and Professions Code to the Health and Safety Code. While the recommendation mentions that diversion to YDD can potentially go beyond Penal Code 640 violations, without an explicit demand and with Citation Diversion remaining on all citation documentation (for example, the ticket itself), there is significant concern that law enforcement will continue to refer all violations outside of Penal Code 640 to the Citation Diversion Program.
- Additionally, the program is currently run out of a single site in Van Nuys. It generally
 requires two appearances (an arraignment, followed by a trial). Dispositions neither take
 into account the current circumstances of the young person nor the circumstances of the
 young person at the time of the citation. It generally results in hundreds of dollars in fees
 and dozens of hours in community service, none of which is connected to youth
 development.
- Finally, Citation Diversion is simply a new form of the Informal Juvenile Traffic Court. The latter was granted jurisdiction through the Superior Court. It's unclear what jurisdiction, if any, was conferred to Citation Diversion, given that it functions entirely outside of Superior Court.
- Section 1b Granting authority to expand the referral network is not sufficient to ensure the success of this recommendation. It will require a significant investment in the YDD infrastructure and the education of other entities that have the power to divert young people away from a punitive system and towards one invested in youth development. Additionally, while the report makes clear that this list of potential referral sources is not exhaustive, a significant amount of work must be done to create an infrastructure to list out and divert young people from all of the different points at which system involvement begins. Finally, this should not result in mandatory participation for young people who would simply benefit from engagement in diversion supported services.

- Aligned with any recommendations resulting from the Youth Justice Work Group, the County should explore an incentive structure so law enforcement agencies in the county participate more fully in YDD referrals.
- The county should explore mechanisms that would make all non-707b offenses mandatorily divertible through YDD, including requesting that the DA agree to not charge any non-707b offenses.



- To effectively reduce law enforcement contact with young people, the county should expand its study of replacing police for certain emergency responses to incidents that involve youth and the creation of community-based youth outreach teams that include peacebuilders and other non-law enforcement youth workers.
- Section 1a Given the questionable legal standing and the lack of any actual youth development and meaningful diversion through this program, Citation Diversion should cease to exist. All outstanding citations should be granted amnesty, as was done in 2012. All new citations must be routed to YDD.
- Section 1b There must be dedicated funding to both educate points of system contact (schools, families, community organizations and members, etc.) about the existence and work of YDD providers and to effectively expand the network of YDD providers.
 Protocols must be created to differentiate between involvement related to alleged violations and involvement related solely to self-improvement.
- Section 1d Given the concerns on what diversion actually means to different entities,
 we strongly support the effort to develop and share county-wide definitions for diversion
 and youth development. As diversion programs expand, it is important that they be
 based on best practices and principles of youth development so the County can assure
 that it is resourcing programs which will reduce youth contact with the justice system.
- 2. Probation and YDD will enhance and expand training/outreach to law enforcement and other pertinent juvenile justice partners to provide pre-arrest options available through YDD and other community-based partners; ensure a shared understanding of Probation's detention practices; and equitably reduce the number of young people detained, exploring opportunities to share written protocol(s).

Concerns and Considerations:

- Each of these steps is incredibly vague. Enhancing and expanding training and outreach
 without a specific list of entities leaves far too much room for interpretation. Additionally,
 the stated topic for enhancing and expanding training and outreach does nothing to
 educate and change the culture of how law enforcement typically interacts with young
 people.
- For the last few decades, much of what the community has asked for is transparency. In the planning process, we asked multiple times for a copy of Probation's "detention practices," which they originally called a protocol, but the Department never produced any information. It is entirely unclear who will share in this understanding of Probation's detention practices, what steps will be taken to equitably reduce the detained youth population and what it means to explore opportunities to share written protocols.



- Part of enhancing training and outreach on pre-arrest options must also include an
 opportunity for YDD providers to educate law enforcement on the benefits of youth
 development and diversion. The goal should be to build relationships between
 community based organizations committed to youth development and diversion and law
 enforcement in order to change the existing cycles of system involvement.
- All work around sharing detention practices, work around equitably reducing the
 detained youth population and written protocols should be shared with the public, similar
 to the manner in which the policies and procedures of the Sheriff's Department are
 shared on their website.
- 3. Where appropriate, Probation will continue to limit detention to youth with sex offenses (PC 290.008(c)), mandatory detention per Welfare and Institutions Code section 625.3 (i.e., youth 14 or older who are taken into custody for the personal use of a firearm in the commission or attempted commission of a felony or for any offense listed in subdivision (b) of WIC Section 707), and placement youth in warrant status or who require replacement.
 - a. Develop and disseminate a standard YDD post-release (juvenile hall) referral process in collaboration with community and other stakeholders to support youth and caregivers through referral to the YDD network.
 - b. Increase connection to supportive services for youth and families while youth are detained, specifically in juvenile hall.

Concerns and Considerations:

- While we support the sentiment of this section, we are concerned by the lack of specificity in its commitment. In stating "where appropriate," the Probation Department is not committing to any real change in policy or practice. There is no transparency on who makes the decision of what is "appropriate" (is this Probation, the District Attorney, or the arresting officer?),how the decision will be made and what protocols, if any, Probation is relying on when making these decisions.
- Section 3b It is unclear how YDD providers will be able to build a meaningful connection with youth with the current Probation-imposed limitations on who is allowed and resourced to work with young people in juvenile hall.



- In order to assess the impact of this section of the Plan, Probation should collect data on all petitions for detention considered by the Department, the related offenses, and the outcomes of the petition (i.e. whether the youth was released or detained), the reason for detention (if applicable), and demographics of the young person in order to assess and ensure equity. These data should be anonymized and made public on at least a quarterly basis.
- Section 3a Ensure robust involvement by community-based service providers and communities impacted by the juvenile justice system in creating the YDD referral process from juvenile hall. The referral process should be trauma informed, and it should be made clear to youth and families that all services offered are voluntary.
- Section 3b Expand resources and access to community-based organizations so they
 can work with young people in all juvenile halls and camps, and build a meaningful
 relationship before young people are released. CBO's should act as a support system to
 youth and families during court proceedings, in juvenile halls and camps, and upon reentry. Furthermore, YDD should assess outcomes and experiences for those connected
 to these services while incarcerated and upon release.
- 4. Informed by the role of the bench warrant protocol in reducing the population of incarcerated youth during COVID-19 and dependent on support from the Juvenile Court, support proposal to cite bench warrants without new arrest charges to court and start supervision (for those youth on Probation) rather than detain for non-sex offense (290.008 (c)), non 707(b), non-felony or attempted felony with personal use of a firearm.

Concerns and Considerations:

- At no point during this process was Probation able to articulate the details around what
 role the bench warrant protocol played in reducing the population, the parameters of the
 protocol and how it was used from March to present.
- Probation asserted that the protocol was a document that existed solely between the Court and Probation and that sharing of this document would require approval from the Court. Such a document and any related actions based upon it would amount to ex parte communication, which is unethical.

Solutions:

 Any and all protocols should be shared publicly. Young people and their attorneys have every right to know what this protocol says, how it is being applied and when it is being



applied. Without this protocol and related practices being made public, there is absolutely no opportunity to create system accountability nor to ensure the equitable application to all youth subject to Probation's jurisdiction.

- 5. YDD and Probation will collaborate to evaluate outcomes for youth detained and released since March 2020, and those diverted or otherwise released early from detention facilities, going forward.
 - a. Demographic characteristics of youth released, diverted, and detained to better understand equity in access;
 - b. Information about the stage at which and reason for which a young person is diverted or released;
 - c. Timeframes of detention, release, referral, and enrollment in services by type to better understand how quickly young people are being connected to diversion and reentry services;
 - d. Outcomes for young people experiencing various interventions, including measures of youth wellbeing and any further contact with the justice system;
 - e. Opportunities to invest in promising practices and reduce gaps and barriers to services for young people and families.
 - f. Opportunities to use findings to inform data collection and assessment practices moving forward.

Concerns and Considerations:

- While we support this recommendation, concerns about the Probation Department's ability to collect data,¹ as well as the accuracy of those collected,² are well documented. We support improved data collection in order to inform this Plan and further reduce the population of incarcerated young people; however, Probation should not receive any additional funding to do this. Further concerns about the Department's oversized budget will be further discussed in the subsequent section.
- It is unclear how these data and the evaluation will be shared with the public.

http://prit.lacounty.gov/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=KiQVxe NyNw%3d&portalid=37

² Matt Stiles. "'Unreliable' data threatening reforms at L.A. County's juvenile detention centers." *The Los Angeles Times.* March 16, 2019. Accessed August 8, 2020: https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-county-juvenile-detention-pepper-spray-20190316-story.html



¹ Resource Development Associates, Inc. "Summary of RDA Final Report Recommendations." *October 12, 2018.* Accessed August 8, 2020:

 Probation and YDD should provide monthly updates on this analysis during community town halls and on their websites.

More Transparency and Accountability is Needed

As it stands right now, Probation and YDD will report back in some manner, however they so choose, in six and twelve months. Given the number of questions and concerns raised by community partners in this document, it is absolutely necessary for there to be quarterly reports that are agendized at the public safety cluster meetings so that both Supervisors and the community have the opportunity to ask the questions that demand answers. This will ensure the implementation of all that has been so loosely committed to in the Plan and create a space for much needed transparency and accountability.

LA County is on track to spend over \$750,000 per youth per year in incarceration. We must shift resources from youth incarceration to community-based services for youth development, diversion, and re-entry.

In a time of unprecedented economic hardship and outcry for an end to racist systems of incarceration, it is imperative that the Board of Supervisors divert funds from youth incarceration towards systems of care and youth development. The challenges facing youth, families, community-based organizations, and local governments will only get worse as COVID 19 continues to hit our communities, and LA County cannot justify the astronomical cost of keeping an ever-decreasing number of youth incarcerated in juvenile camps and halls.

The *Juvenile Institution Services* budget unit--which funds the juvenile halls, intake and detention control, community detention services, transportation, Dorothy Kirby Center (DKC), and probation camps--has continued to increase, despite the fact that the population of youth detained in these institutions has dramatically decreased. From FY 2014-15 to FY 2019-20 *Juvenile Institution Services* increased by almost \$35 million, from approximately \$363 million to over \$397 million in FY 2019-20. Meanwhile, the Average Daily Population of incarcerated youth in LA County decreased by 39% from 2014 to 2019.³ If *Juvenile Institution Services* stays funded at the FY 2019-20 level, and the current population of detained youth is maintained (which has been around 500 youth in camps and halls combined since the motion passed).⁴ LA

⁴ Los Angeles County Probation COVID-19 Weekly Update August 14, 2020 https://probation.lacounty.gov/wp-content/uploads/081420WEEKLYUPDATE.pdf



³ Board of State and Community Corrections Juvenile Detention Profile Survey. "Table 36. Los Angeles Combined Juvenile Facilities Population Trends for 2002 through 2020." https://bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/JDPS-1Q2002-1Q2020.pdf

County will spend over \$750,000 per year to keep just one young person incarcerated. If the county is truly committed to a care first agenda, this investment should go towards youth's health, education, and wellbeing rather than traumatizing systems of incarceration.

In order to support youth, families, and the vital ecosystem of community-based youth services in LA County in this time of crisis, the Board should reinvest a significant part of the *Juvenile Institutions Services* budget to fund needed youth development, diversion and re-entry services. Some recommended investments include:

- Significantly increase funding to youth housing, especially housing linked to re-entry services
- Fund community-based re-entry services across the county and resource CBO's for more programming in camps/halls to provide in-reach/transition services
- Fund gang intervention services and credible messengers/life coaches in areas across the County
- Make sure justice-involved youth have access to technology (computer and internet) to be able to stay engaged during COVID-19

This could be done immediately through the passage of the supplemental budget. As increased community support is needed now, the County could reinvest the funds through existing community-based contracts and youth-serving public agencies and further support the reduction in the incarcerated youth population. For instance, LAYUP compiled an <u>inventory of community-based re-entry services</u> with over 40 organizations and the ability to serve over 900 youth through a variety of programming and services, many of which have existing partnerships with the County or other local government agencies. We would be happy to collaborate to assess and identify the needed services where funds could be reinvested immediately.

Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration. We hope to collaborate further to make sure that young people are invested in through a care-first model.

Sincerely,

ACLU of SoCal
Alma Family Services
Anti-Recidivism Coalition
Arts for Incarcerated Youth Network
California Conference for Equality and Justice
Centinela Youth Services
Children's Defense Fund-California
Coalition for Engaged Education



Healing Dialogue and Action
InnerCity Struggle
L.A.U.R.A.
Loyola Law School - Youth Justice Education Clinic
New Earth
Public Counsel
Social Justice Learning Institute
Tía Chucha's Centro Cultural
Urban Peace Institute
WriteGirl/Bold Ink Writers
Youth Justice Coalition

CC:

Esther Lim, Justice Deputy to Supervisor Hilda Solis
Chris Ah San, Assistant Deputy to Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Veronica Pawlowski, Justice Deputy to Supervisor Sheila Kuehl; Shelby King, Associate Justice
Deputy to Supervisor Sheila Kuehl; AJ Young, Associate Justice Deputy to Supervisor Sheila
Kuehl

Kyla Coates, Justice and Mental Health Deputy to Supervisor Janice Hahn Elisa Arcidiacono, Justice Deputy to Supervisor Kathryn Barger













FREE OUR FUTURE.































FREE OUR FUTURE.



FREE OUR FUTURE.

外外外外外外外外外上



August 10, 2020

Los Angeles County **Board of Supervisors**

Mark Ridley-Thomas

TO:

Supervisor Kathryn Barger, Chair

Supervisor Hilda L. Solis

Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas

Supervisor Sheila Kuehl Supervisor Janice Hahn

Second District Sheila Kuehl Third District

Janice Hahn Fourth District

Hilda L. Solis

First District

FROM:

Christina R. Ghaly, M.D., Director

Department of Health Services

Kathryn Barger Fifth District Ray Leyva, Interim Chief **Probation Department**

SUBJECT:

MAINTAINING THE DECREASED POPULATION OF INCARCERATED YOUTH IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

(ITEM #10, JUNE 9, 2020)

Christina R. Ghaly, M.D.

Director

Hal F. Yee, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.

Chief Deputy Director, Clinical Affairs

Nina J. Park, M.D. Chief Deputy Director, Population Health

313 N. Figueroa Street, Suite 912 Los Angeles, CA 90012

> Tel: (213) 288-8050 Fax: (213) 481-0503

www.dhs.lacounty.gov

"To advance the health of our patients and our communities by providing extraordinary care"



On June 9, 2020 the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed the Probation Department (Probation) and the Youth Development and Diversion (YDD) Office, in consultation with the Public Defender's Office, the Alternate Public Defender's Office, the Independent Juvenile Defender's Office, the District Attorney's (DA) office, the Courts, the Chief Executive Office (CEO), County Counsel, Department of Mental Health (DMH), Department of Health Services (DHS), Department of Public Health (DPH), and community stakeholders to report back in 30 days with a plan for maintaining the reductions - and where possible continuing to reduce populations of youth in the juvenile camps and halls at or below the levels reached during this pandemic to avoid returning to the higher incarceration numbers and rates at which youth were detained prior to March 2020, including recommendations for:

- a. Supporting and expanding community-based alternatives to detention services and placement options, including the reallocation of existing resources in order to prioritize such alternatives;
- b. Legislative and local policy changes to support this goal;
- c. Evaluating outcomes for youth released since March 2020, and those diverted or otherwise released early from detention facilities, going forward.

This report is reflective of the collective efforts between YDD and Probation along with other stakeholders. The initial report was due July 9, 2020; however, Probation and YDD requested a 30-day extension in order to convene a small collaborative planning group to review and revise a plan for maintaining the reduced population of incarcerated youth.



From: Sophia Cristo

Sent: Thursday, April 8, 2021 11:23 AM **To:** info-POC <info@poc.lacounty.gov>

Subject: Public Comment-Item #6 POC 4/8/2021

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Good morning Commissioners, my name is Sophia Cristo, I'm a youth advocate with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I'm here today to speak on item #6. As a young woman that was incarcerated for 10 years and was traumatized and affected by both the adult and juvenile justice systems, I would like to point out and focus on the importance of the closure of DJJ and an effective alternative, such as discussed in the youth justice reimagined report. To be effective, it is important that we also continue to maintain the reduced number of incarcerated youth. This commission has the duty to bring transparency and accountability. I urge this commission to ask the right questions and make sure the department you oversee as commissioners, is moving to the right path of Youth Justice Reimagined. It's disappointing to see that in their report backs with YDD, it lacks to provide real information on how to make sure the population of youth reduces. If our goal here is to really help our youth, these are the effective measures that need to be instilled and take place. We must move to youth justice reimagined. Thank you

From: Kenzo Sohoue

Sent: Thursday, April 8, 2021 11:45 AM **To:** info-POC <info@poc.lacounty.gov>

Subject: Public Comment

CAUTION: External Email. Proceed Responsibly.

Item #6

Item #6

My name is Kenzo Sohoue, I'm a youth advocate with the Anti-Recidivism Coalition. I am here as a youth who has been directly impacted by incarceration for 4 years and under probation conditions. In the progress of the closure of DJJ and keeping youth in Los Angeles County, it will be highly effective to keep the decrease the amount of youth in Halls and camps. Which will reduce the amount of youth that would have gone to DJJ. Report back shows that not much is done to ensure the continued reduction of the incarcerated youth population. The compound should not be an alternative to DJJ because it consists of an unstable environment and has a variety of adult offender that can be an impact on youth that want to turn their lives around. Our youth in camps and halls right now deserve to be treated fairly and humanely in these facilities. I am here to simply ask that this commission makes sure they are holding the probation department accountable through the powers you have. This is very significant and important if we want to really get to the vision of youth justice reimagined in our county. So, when will we show that we do care about youth and their future growth?

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information from The Anti-Recidivism Coalition. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient or the employee responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please email us at admin@antirecidivism.org or call 213-955-5885.